Remarks

This REPLY is in response to the Office Action mailed November 2, 2006. A Petition for Extension of Time is submitted herewith, together with the appropriate fee. No fee is due for the addition of new claims.

I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections

Prior to the Office Action mailed November 2, 2006, Claims 1-18 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, Claims 1-8 and 10-17 were objected to because of various informalities. Claims 1-3, 5, 7-12, 14 and 16-18 were provisionally rejected under the doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over the claims of co-pending Application No. 10/601,898. Claims 1-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1, 7, 8, 10, 13, 16 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Najmi (U.S. Patent No. 6,753,889).

II. Summary of Applicant's Amendment

The present Reply amends the Specification, and Claims 1-7 and 10-16; cancels Claims 8 and 17; and adds new Claim 19, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 1-7, 9-16, 18 and 19. An appropriate Terminal Disclaimer is also being filed herewith. Reconsideration of the Application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

III. Amendments to the Specification

The Specification has been amended as shown above to correct various informalities, including providing application numbers for copending applications, and capitalizing the use of the term JAVA where it occurs in the Specification. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter is being added.

IV.   Claim Objections

In the Office Action mailed November 2, 2006, Claims 1-8 and 10-17 were objected to because of various informalities. Accordingly, Claims 8 and 17 have been canceled, and Claim 1-7 and 10-16 have been amended as shown above to correct the informalities. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

V.   Claim Rejections under Double Patenting

In the Office Action mailed November 2, 2006, Claims 1-3, 5, 7-12, 14 and 16-18 were provisionally rejected under the doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over the claims of co-pending Application No. 10/601,898. Accordingly, filed together with this Reply is an appropriate Terminal Disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321. Applicant respectfully submits that the filing of a Terminal Disclaimer renders moot the rejection of the claims under the doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

VI.   Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101

In the Office Action mailed November 2, 2006, Claims 1-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Accordingly, Claims 8 and 17 have been canceled, and the remaining claims amended as shown above. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as amended now conform to the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

VII.   Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

In the Office Action mailed November 2, 2006, Claims 1, 7, 8, 10, 13, 16 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Accordingly, Claims 8 and 17 have been canceled, and Claims 1, 7, 10, 13, and 16 have been amended as shown above. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as amended now conform to the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

VIII. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

In the Office Action mailed November 2, 2006, Claims 1-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Najmi (U.S. Patent No. 6,753,889).

Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define the embodiment therein. As amended, Claim 1 defines:

> *1.   (Currently Amended) A system including an integrated development environment for use with a mark-up language, comprising:*
> *an integrated development environment that includes a graphical user interface that executes on a client machine, and that allows a user to enter a markup language program;*
> *a parser that receives the markup language program from the integrated development environment and parses the markup language program to extract markup language commands;*
> *a command processor that validates the markup language commands, and, for each markup language command converts the markup language command into a command object for communication to a command dispatcher;*
> *a command dispatcher that receives command objects from the command processor and, for each command object, assigns the command object to one of a plurality of categories corresponding to a plurality of application program interfaces;*
> *a plurality of processor modules, including a processor module for each category of application program interface, wherein each processor module receives the command objects assigned to its category, and performs appropriate operations against the corresponding application program interface; and*
> *wherein the integrated development environment allows the user to edit and modify the markup language program as desired to access the application program interfaces.*

Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define the embodiment therein as comprising an integrated development environment which includes a graphical user interface that executes on a client machine, and that allows a user to enter a markup language program. The markup language program is parsed to extract markup language commands. A command processor and

- 13 -

a command dispatcher then converts each markup language command into a command object and assigns the command object to one of a plurality of categories corresponding to a plurality of application program interfaces. Processor modules receive the command objects assigned to their category, and perform appropriate operations against the corresponding application program interface.

The advantages of the embodiment defined by Claim 1 include that the system abstracts the complexity of using various API's (such as the JMS and the JMX API's) into a number of simpler markup tags. The system then presents the user with a graphical user interface, through which the user can easily enter markup tags, and programs that include markup tags. This allows multiple operations, spanning multiple types of API, to be defined within a single program. For example, in one embodiment operations can be entered into the graphical user interface as a Java Message Service Markup Language (JMSML) program or a plurality of JMSML commands. The system parses the JMSML commands, and determines which category of API the command should be directed to. Since the system abstracts much of the operation of a complex interfaces, such as the JMS interface, it allows a software developer to access the interface by modifying entries in the graphical user interface, which is a much simpler task than directly programming against the JMS interface.

Najmi discloses a business to business (B2B) message adapter generation tool for use in describing a B2B message adapter in an enterprise computer system. In one embodiment, the enterprise computer system is a J2EE based enterprise computer system. The B2B messenger is coupled to a Java Message Service API (referred to as JMS) that provides an interface between the B2B messenger and the various business components included in the J2EE based enterprise computer system. (Column 3, Lines 49-57).

It appears from the above description that, in Najmi, the system therein is directed to a method of JMS message generation that can be used in B2B workflow messaging. In particular, the system therein allows communications between two business workflow processes using the publish-subscribe features of JMS or a similar messaging platform. However, Applicant respectfully submits that Najmi does not appear to disclose or suggest tools or features that would allow a developer to more conveniently program those JMS messages. Nor does Najimi appear to disclose the additional features of Claim 1, as currently amended.

- 14 -

In view of the comments provided above, Applicant respectfully submits that the embodiment defined by Claim 1 is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claim 10

The comments provided above with respect to Claim 1 are hereby incorporated by reference. Claim 10 has been similarly amended to more clearly define the embodiment therein. For similar reasons as provided above with respect to Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 10, as amended, is likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-9 and 11-18

Claims 8 and 17 have been canceled, rendering moot the rejection of these claims. Claims 2-7, 9, 11-16 and 18 are not addressed separately, but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the amendments and the comments provided above. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

IX.   Additional Amendments

Claim 19 has been newly added by the present Response. Applicant respectfully requests that new Claim 19 be included in the Application and considered therewith.

X.   Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

Enclosed is a PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for extending the time to respond up to and including April 2, 2007.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: _____2007-04-02_____   By: /Karl F. Kenna/_____

Karl Kenna
Reg. No. 45,445

Customer No.: 23910
FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, Fourteenth Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800